arXiv:1601.03458v1 [cs.DS] 14 Jan 2016

Characterizing a Set of Popular Matchings Defined by Preference Lists with Ties

Tomomi Matsui and Takayoshi Hamaguchi

Graduate School of Decision Science and Technology,
Tokyo Institute of Technology,
Ookayama 2-12-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8552, Japan

January 13, 2016

Abstract In this paper, we give a simple characterization of a set of popular matchings defined by preference lists with ties. By employing our characterization, we propose a polynomial time algorithm for finding a minimum cost popular matching.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we give a characterization of a set of popular matchings in a bipartite graph with one-sided preference lists. The concept of a popular matching was first introduced by Gardenfors [5]. Recently, Abraham et al. [1] discussed a problem for finding a popular matching and proposed polynomial time algorithms for problem instances defined by preference lists with or without ties. McDermid and Irving [10] discussed a set of popular matchings defined by strict preference lists. One of a remained open problems raised in [8, 10] and [9] (Section 7.7) is a characterization of a set of popular matchings when given preference lists have ties. This paper solves the above open problem affirmatively and gives an explicit characterization of a set of popular matchings defined by preference lists with ties. By employing our characterization, we can transform a minimum cost popular matching problem, discussed in [8, 10], to a simple minimum cost assignment problem.

2 Main Result

An instance of popular matching problem comprises a set A of *applicants* and a set P of *posts*. Each applicant $a \in A$ has a preference list in which she ranks some posts in weak order (i.e., ties are allowed). Given any applicant $a \in A$, and given any posts $p, p' \in P$, applicant a *prefers* p to p' if both p and p' appear in a's preference list, and p precedes p' on a's preference list. We assume that each applicant $a \in A$ has a specified post $l(a)$, called *last resort* of a, such that $l(a)$ appears only in a's preference list and $l(a)$ is a unique, most undesirable post of a. The existence of last resorts implies that $|A| \leq |P|$. We say that a

pair $(a, p) \in A \times P$ is *acceptable* if and only if post p appears in a's preference list. We denote the set of acceptable pairs by $E \subseteq A \times P$. This paper deals with a bipartite graph $G = (A \cup P, E)$ consisting of vertex set $A \cup P$ and edge set E. Throughout this paper, we denote $|A| + |P|$ by n and $|E|$ by m.

A subset of acceptable pairs $M \subseteq E$ is called a *matching* if and only if each applicant and post appears in at most one pair in M. We say that $v \in A \cup P$ is *matched* in M, when M includes a pair (a, p) satisfying $v \in \{a, p\}$. A set of matched nodes of M is denoted by ∂M. For each pair $(a, p) \in M$, we denote $M(a) = p$ and $M(p) = a$.

We say that an applicant $a \in A$ prefers matching M' to M, if (i) a is matched in M' and unmatched in M, or (ii) a is matched in both M' and M, and a prefers $M'(a)$ to $M(a)$. A matching M' is *more popular* than M if the number of applicants that prefer M' to M exceeds the number of applicants that prefer M to M'. A matching M is *popular* if and only if there is no matching M' that is more popular than M. The existence of the set of last resorts implies that we only need to consider applicant-complete matching, since any unmatched applicant can be allocated to her last resort. Throughout this paper, we deal with popular matchings which are applicant-complete.

For each applicant $a \in A$, we define $f(a) \subseteq P$ to be the set of a's most-preferred posts. We call any such post $p \in f(a)$ an *f-post* of applicant a. We define the *first-choice graph* of G as $G_1 = (A \cup P, E_1)$, where $E_1 = \{(a, p) \in E \mid \exists a \in A,\ p \in f(a)\}$.

Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ be the set of maximum cardinality matchings of G_1 and k_1^* be the size of a maximum cardinality matching of G_1. Let $P_1 \subseteq P$ be a subset of posts which are matched in every matching in $\mathcal{M}_1$. For each applicant $a \in A$, define $s(a)$ to be the set of most-preferred posts in a's preference list that are not in P_1. Every post in $s(a)$ is called an *s-post* of applicant a. We define $E_2 = \{(a, p) \in A \times P \mid p \in f(a) \cup s(a)\}$ and $G_2 = (A \cup P, E_2)$.

Abraham et al. [1] showed the following characterization of popular matchings.

Theorem 1 (Abraham et al. [1])**.** *An applicant-complete matching $M \subseteq E$ of G is popular if and only if M satisfies* (i) *$M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and* (ii) *$M \subseteq E_2$.*

Now. we describe our main result. A *cover* of a given graph $G_1 = (A \cup P, E_1)$ is a subset of vertices $X \subseteq A \cup P$ satisfying that $\forall (a, p) \in E_1$, $\{a, p\} \cap X \neq \emptyset$.

Theorem 2. *Assume that a given instance has at least one popular matching. Let $X \subseteq A \cup P$ be a minimum cover of G_1. We define $\widetilde{P} = P \cap X$ and*

$$\widetilde{E} \;=\; \Big(E_1 \cap (X_A \times \overline{X_P})\Big) \cup \Big(E_1 \cap (\overline{X_A} \times X_P)\Big) \cup \Big(E_2 \cap (\overline{X_A} \times \overline{X_P})\Big)$$

where $X_A = A \cap X$, $X_P = P \cap X$, $\overline{X_A} = A \setminus X$, and $\overline{X_P} = P \setminus X$. Then, an applicant complete matching M in G is popular if and only if $M \subseteq \widetilde{E}$ and every post in $\widetilde{P}$ is matched in M.

3 Characterization of a Set of Popular Matching

First, we introduce a maximum weight matching problem on G_2 defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MP} : \text{maximize} \quad & |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{p \in \delta_2(a)} x(e) \leq 1 \quad (\forall a \in A), \\ & \sum_{a \in \delta_2(p)} x(e) \leq 1 \quad (\forall p \in P), \\ & x(e) \in \{0,1\} \quad (\forall e \in E_2), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\delta_2(v) \subseteq A \cup P$ denotes a set of vertices adjacent with a vertex $v \in A \cup P$ on G_2.

Lemma 1. *An applicant-complete matching $M \subseteq E$ is popular if and only if $M \subseteq E_2$ and the corresponding characteristic vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^{E_2}$ defined by*

$$x(e) = \begin{cases} 1 & (\text{if } e \in M), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

is optimal to MP.

Proof. First, consider a case that a given applicant-complete matching M is popular. Theorem 1 states that $M \subseteq E_2$ and $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Thus, we only need to show that the characteristic vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ is optimal to MP. The corresponding objective function value is equal to

$$|A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) = |A| k_1^* + |A|$$

where k_1^* denotes the size of a maximum cardinality matching of G_1. We show that the optimal value of MP is less than or equal to $|A|k_1^* + |A|$. Let $\boldsymbol{x}'$ be a feasible solution of MP and $M' = \{e \in E_2 \mid x'(e) = 1\}$. Since $M' \cap E_1$ is a matching of G_1, the objective function value corresponding to $\boldsymbol{x}'$ satisfies

$$|A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x'(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x'(e) = |A||M' \cap E_1| + |M'| \leq |A|k_1^* + |A|$$

which gives an upper bound of the optimal value of MP. Thus, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is optimal to MP.

Next, we consider a case that $M \subseteq E_2$ and the corresponding characteristic vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ of M is optimal to MP. Obviously, we only need to show that $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Assume on the contrary that $M \cap E_1 \notin \mathcal{M}_1$. Let $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_1$ be a maximum cardinality matching of G_1 and put $\boldsymbol{x}^* \in \{0,1\}^{E_2}$

be the corresponding characteristic vector. The above assumption implies that $|M \cap E_1| + 1 \leq |M^*|$. Obviously, $\boldsymbol{x}^*$ is feasible to MP and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x^*(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x^*(e) &= |A||M^*| + |M^*| = (|A|+1)|M^*| \\ &\geq (|A|+1)(|M \cap E_1| + 1) > |A||M \cap E_1| + |A| \\ &= |A||M \cap E_1| + |M| = |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the optimality of $\boldsymbol{x}$. From the above, we obtain that $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Theorem 1 implies that M is popular. □

Now we introduce a linear relaxation problem (LRP) of MP, which is obtained from MP by substituting non-negative constraints $x(e) \geq 0 \ \ (\forall e \in E_2)$ for 0-1 constraints (1). It is well-known that every (0-1 valued) optimal solution of MP is also optimal to LRP [3]. A corresponding dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{D: minimize} \quad & \sum_{a \in A} y(a) + \sum_{p \in P} y(p) & \\ \text{subject to} \quad & y(a) + y(p) \geq |A| + 1 & (\forall (a,p) \in E_1), \\ & y(a) + y(p) \geq 1 & (\forall (a,p) \in E_2 \setminus E_1), \\ & y(v) \geq 0 & (\forall v \in A \cup P). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3. *Let $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ be an optimal solution of D. We define $\widetilde{P} = \{p \in P \mid y^*(p) > 0\}$ and*

$$\widetilde{E} = \{(a,p) \in E_1 \mid y^*(a) + y^*(p) = |A| + 1\} \cup \{(a,p) \in E_2 \setminus E_1 \mid y^*(a) + y^*(p) = 1\}.$$

An applicant-complete matching $M \subseteq E$ is popular if and only if (i) *$M \subseteq \widetilde{E}$, and* (ii) *every posts in $\widetilde{P}$ is matched in M.*

Proof. Let $M \subseteq E$ be an applicant-complete matching satisfying (i) and (ii). Clearly, (i) implies that $M \subseteq \widetilde{E} \subseteq E_2$. From property (ii), every post p unmatched in M satisfies that $y^*(p) = 0$. The characteristic vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ of M indexed by E_2 satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) &= (|A|+1) \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2 \setminus E_1} x(e) \\ &= \sum_{e \in M \cap E_1} (|A|+1) + \sum_{e \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)} 1 \\ &= \sum_{(a,p) \in M \cap E_1} (y^*(a) + y^*(p)) + \sum_{(a,p) \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)} (y^*(a) + y^*(p)) \\ &= \sum_{v \in \partial M} y^*(v) = \sum_{a \in A} y^*(a) + \sum_{p \in P \cap \partial M} y^*(p) = \sum_{a \in A} y^*(a) + \sum_{p \in P} y^*(p), \end{aligned}$$

where ∂M denotes a set of vertices of G_2 matched in M. Since $\boldsymbol{x}$ is feasible to LRP, the weak duality theorem implies that $\boldsymbol{x}$ is optimal to LRP. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is feasible to MP, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is also optimal to MP. Then, Lemma 1 implies the popularity of M.

Conversely, consider a case that an applicant-complete matching $M \subseteq E$ is popular. Lemma 1 implies that $M \subseteq E_2$ and the corresponding characteristic vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ is optimal to MP. Dantzig [3] showed that $\boldsymbol{x}$ is also optimal to LRP. The strong duality theorem implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left(\sum_{a \in A} y^*(a) + \sum_{p \in P} y^*(p) \right) - \left(|A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) \right) \\
&= \sum_{(a,p) \in M} (y^*(a) + y^*(p)) + \sum_{p \in P \setminus \partial M} y^*(p) - \left((|A|+1) \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2 \setminus E_1} x(e) \right) \\
&= \sum_{(a,p) \in M \cap E_1} (y^*(a) + y^*(p) - (|A|+1)) \qquad (2) \\
&+ \sum_{(a,p) \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)} (y^*(a) + y^*(p) - 1) + \sum_{p \in P \setminus \partial M} y^*(p). \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ is feasible to D, each term in (2) or (3) is equal to 0, i.e., we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&y^*(a) + y^*(p) = |A| + 1, \ \ \forall (a,p) \in M \cap E_1, \\
&y^*(a) + y^*(p) = 1, \ \ \forall (a,p) \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1), \\
&y^*(p) = 0, \ \ \forall p \in P \setminus \partial M.
\end{aligned}
$$

As a consequence, conditions (i) and (ii) hold. □

Now we prove Theorem 2. Let us recall the following well-known theorem.

Theorem 4 (König [7])**.** *The size of a minimum cover of G_1 is equal the size of a maximum cardinality matching in G_1.*

When we have a minimum cover, we can construct an optima solution of dual problem D easily.

Lemma 2. *Assume that a given instance has at least one popular matching. Let $X \subseteq A \cup P$ be a minimum cover of G_1. When we define a vector $\boldsymbol{y}^* \in \mathbb{Z}^{A \cup P}$ by*

$$
y^*(v) = \begin{cases} |A| + 1 & (\text{if } v \in A \cap X), \\ 1 & (\text{if } v \in A \setminus X), \\ |A| & (\text{if } v \in P \cap X), \\ 0 & (\text{if } v \in P \setminus X), \end{cases} \qquad (4)
$$

then $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ is optimal to D*.*

Proof. First, we show that $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ is feasible to D. Obviously, $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ satisfies non-negative constraints. For any edge $(a,p) \in E_2 \setminus E_1$, $y^*(a) + y^*(p) \geq y^*(a) \geq 1$. For any edge $(a,p) \in E_1$, the definition of a cover implies that $\{a,p\} \cap X \neq \emptyset$, and thus $y^*(a) + y^*(p) \geq |A| + 1$. From the above discussion, $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ is a feasible solution of D.

Since there exists a popular matching, the optimal value of MP is equal to $|A|k_1^* + |A|$. König's theorem says that $|X| = k_1^*$ and thus the optimal value of MP is equal to $|A|k_1^* + |A| = |A||X| + |A|$. The weak duality implies that $|A||X|+|A|$ gives a lower bound of the optimal value of D. Since $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ is feasible to D and the corresponding objective value attains the lower bound $|A||X| + |A|$, $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ is optimal to D. □

Lastly, we describe a proof of our main result.

Proof of Theorem 2. When a given instance has at least one popular matching, dual solution $\boldsymbol{y}^*$ defined by (4) is optimal to D. Thus, Theorem 3 directly implies Theorem 2. □

In the rest of this section, we describe a method for constructing sets $\widetilde{P}$ and $\widetilde{E}$ efficiently. First, we apply Hopcroft and Karp's algorithm [6] to G_1 and find a maximum cardinality matching and a minimum (size) cover X of G_1 simultaneously. Next, we employ an algorithm proposed by Abraham et al. [1] and check the existence of a popular matching. If a given instance has at least one popular matching, then we construct sets $\widetilde{P}$ and $\widetilde{E}$ defined in Theorem 2. The total computational effort required in the above procedure is bounded by $\mathrm{O}(\sqrt{n}m)$ time.

4 Optimal Popular Matching

Kavitha and Nasre [8] studied some problems for finding a matching that is not only popular, but is also optimal with respect to some additional criterion. McDermid and Irving [10] discussed these problems in case that given preference lists are strictly ordered, and proposed efficient algorithms based on a specified structure called "*switching graph*." Their algorithms find (P1) a maximum cardinality popular matching in $\mathrm{O}(n+m)$ time, (P2) a minimum cost maximum cardinality popular matching in $\mathrm{O}(n+m)$ time, (P3) a rank-maximal popular matching in $\mathrm{O}(n \log n + m)$ time, or (P4) a fair popular matching in $\mathrm{O}(n \log n + m)$ time. They also showed that all the above problems are reduced to minimum weight popular matching problems by introducing appropreate edge costs $w : E_2 \to \mathbb{Z}$.

In the following, we discuss a minimum cost popular matching problem defined by preference lists with ties. As shown in Theorem 2, we can characterize a set of popular matchings by a pair of sets $\widetilde{P}$ and $\widetilde{E}$. Thus, we can find a minimum cost popular matching by solving the following minimum cost assignment

problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{MCP: minimize} \quad & \sum_{e \in E_2} w(e)x(e) \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{e \in \delta_2(a)} x(e) = 1 \ \ (\forall a \in A), \\
& \sum_{e \in \delta_2(p)} x(e) = 1 \ \ (\forall p \in \widetilde{P}), \\
& \sum_{e \in \delta_2(p)} x(e) \leq 1 \ \ (\forall p \in P \setminus \widetilde{P}), \\
& x(e) = 0 \quad (\forall e \in E_2 \setminus \widetilde{E}). \\
& x(e) \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall e \in E_2).
\end{aligned}$$

A well-known succesive shortest path method solves the above problem in $\mathrm{O}(n(n \log n + m))$ time (see [2] for example).

5 Discussions

In this paper, we give a simple characterization of a set of popular matchings defined by preference lists with ties. By employing our characterization, we can find a minimum cost popular matching in $\mathrm{O}(n(n \log n + m))$ time.

When we deal with a problem for finding a popular matching with a property (P1), (P2), (P3) or (P4), there exists a possibility to reduce the time complexity, since the corresponding edge cost has a special structure. However, we need a detailed discussion, since problem MCP has both equality and inequality constraints.

We can construct an algorithm for enumerating all the popular matchings by employing an idea appearing in [4]. The required computational effort is bounded by $\mathrm{O}(\sqrt{n}m + K(n+m))$ where K denotes the total number of popular matchings. We omit the details of the enumeration algorithm.

References

[1] D. J. Abraham, R. W. Irving, T. Kavitha, and K. Mehlhorn, "Popular matchings," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **37** (2007), pp. 1030–1045.

[2] R. K. Ahuja, T. L. Magnanti, and J. B. Orlin, *Network Flows: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, Prentice-Hall, 1993.

[3] G. B. Dantzig, "Application of the simplex method to a transportation problem," *In: Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation*, T. C. Koopmans, ed., Wiley, New York, pp. 359–373, 1951.

[4] K. Fukuda and T. Matsui, "Finding all the perfect matchings in bipartite graphs," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, **7** (1994), pp. 15–18.

[5] P. Gardenfors, "Match making: assignments based on bilateral preferences," *Behavioral Science*, **20** (1975), pp. 166–173.

[6] J. E. Hopcroft and R. M. Karp, "An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **2** (1973), pp. 225–231.

[7] D. König, "Graphs and matrices," *Matematikai es Fizikai Lapok,* **38** (1931), pp. 116–119 (in Hungarian).

[8] T. Kavitha and M. Nasre, "Optimal popular matchings," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **157** (2009), pp. 3181–3186.

[9] D. F. Manlove, *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*, World Scientific, 2013.

[10] E. McDermid and R. W. Irving, "Popular matchings: structure and algorithms," *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, **22** (2011), pp. 339–358.